

REMARKS

This amendment is in response to the Office Action dated October 20, 2006.

Of claims 1, 2, 4, 6–14, 19–28, 74, 76, 92, 94, and 109, which were pending in the application, the Examiner has decided that:

claims 1, 2, 4, 8 – 14, and 19 – 28 were objected to;

claims 6 and 7 were rejected; and

claims 74, 76, 92, 94, and 109 were allowed.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 – 14, and 19 – 28 were objected to.

In claims 1 and 4, the term “layers” has been corrected to “layer,” thus addressing the Examiner’s objection to claims 1 and 4, and to dependent claims 2, 9 – 14, and 19 – 28.

Claim 8 has been rewritten in independent form, to overcome the examiner’s objection.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC § 102(b)

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b), as anticipated by Demiryont;

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC § 102(b), as anticipated by De Vries.

Applicant has considered the Examiner’s rejection.

Respectfully, Applicant traverses the rejection.

Yet, in order to expedite prosecution, applicant has canceled claims 6 and 7.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 8 – 14, 19 – 28, 74, 76, 92, 94, and 109, are now pending in the application.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed this application is now in condition for allowance, and an early Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: January 19, 2007